

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and continued examination of this application in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

By this Amendment Claims 32-35 have been cancelled. Claims 1-31, 36-39 and 41 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended to correct a typographical error.

1. Status of the Claims

The indication of allowance of Claims 1-31 and of allowable subject matter in Claim 36 (in the previous Office Action) and in Claim 41 is noted with thanks and appreciation. Claims 32--39 and 41 have been rejected. Claim 36 drawn to a bridge was objected to in the previous Office Action but has again been rejected in the present Office Action only under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

2. Rejection of Claims 32-35

The Examiner rejected claims 32-35 under § 102 for being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,702,337 to Rutter et al. ("Rutter"). Applicants have cancelled Claims 32-35, reserving the option to file a continuation application to pursue claims of similar scope.

3. Objections to Claims 36 and 41

Claim 36 has been amended to include all of the recited elements of Claim 32 on which it depends, with exception of the "integral with" language that has been objected to in this Office Action. As amended, Claim 36 has been placed in the independent form indicated as being allowable in the previous Office Action dated December 10, 2004.

Claim 41 has also been rendered as an independent claim, including all the limitations recited in Claim 37 on which it depends, to place it in condition for allowance, as was indicated in the Office Action dated May 2, 2005.

4. Rejection of Claims 37-39 and 41

Claims 37-39 were rejected under § 102 for being anticipated by Rutter.

Independent claim 37 was amended to include the underlined limitations of:

a rotatable collar adapted on its inside to be secured to a component of the filler system, and
a ridge protruding circumferentially outwardly therefrom, said ridge being shaped and configured to engage with and secure to a support bridge of the filler system.

Claim 37 has been presently further amended to more precisely define a separate support bridge as having connections to the sides of the box. No new matter has been added.


In other words, the adapter of claim 37 can be secured both by its inside “to a component of the filler system” and on its outside by a ridge to a “support bridge,” where the support bridge is now more clearly defined as being a separate element from the spout assembly.

In contradistinction, Rutter discloses a ridge 219 extending inwardly, i.e. an internal adaptation for securing, but it does not disclose, teach, or suggest a second element, a ridge protruding circumferentially outwardly, in addition to an internal adaptation. Moreover, Rutter does not disclose, teach, or suggest any external adaptation for securing purposes to a separate support bridge in addition to the internal ridge. Thus, Claim 37, and by extension Claims 38 and 39, which depend upon Claim 37, are now respectfully considered to be patentable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the rejections and objections have been overcome and claims 1-31, 36-39 and 41 are now allowable. An early indication of allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Vangelis Economou
Registration No. 32,341
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: June 8, 2005

RYNDAK & SURI
30 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 2630
Chicago, IL 60602
312-214-7770 (telephone)
312-214-7715 (facsimile)